

HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
DECEMBER 21, 2006 – HIGHWAY MEETING

The Hamilton County Board of Commissioners met on Thursday, December 21, 2006 at 9:00 am in Conference Room 1A in the Hamilton County Government and Judicial Center, One Hamilton County Square, Noblesville, Indiana. A quorum was present of Commissioner Christine Altman and Commissioner Steven C. Dillinger. Commissioner Steven A. Holt arrived at 9:08 a.m.

**Highway Business**

**Thoroughfare Plan Review/Status**

Mr. Brad Davis introduced Nicole Mueller and Rusty Holt of the Schneider Corporation. They have led us in the county's thoroughfare plan review. The next step is to move toward the Steering Committee 3 meeting. The goal of this review is to look at the whole county and incorporate the municipalities thoroughfare plans into one comprehensive plan. To look at corridors throughout the county that are continuous to provide good movement in the future throughout the county and into adjacent counties. To look at multi-modal impact on the county and incorporate that into the thoroughfare plan. Mueller stated there have been a couple of steering committee meetings and they have met with various jurisdictions to gather transportation information. Mueller reviewed the maps with the Commissioners.

Cyntheanne Road

Altman asked if INDOT has the Cyntheanne Road interchange on their radar? Davis stated the interchange is part of a INDOT study of 16 potential new interchanges within the State. They sent a questionnaire to him, which he has completed and sent back to INDOT. Mueller stated it will be on the county thoroughfare plan and Fisher's thoroughfare plan.

Carmel Suburban Residential

Altman stated with Carmel starting to look at urbanization, have they developed anything in their comprehensive plan that we can overlay? Mueller stated Carmel directed them to use their adopted comprehensive plan. They are in the process of updating their plan but it is on hold right now.

Westfield

Altman asked why there is nothing in Westfield? Mueller stated Westfield has just adopted their thoroughfare plan. Up to this point they have used the county's plan.

Cicero

Mueller stated Cicero uses the county's plan.

Cyntheanne Road

Altman asked if we are studying a connector if they build an interchange? Mueller stated right now Cyntheanne goes to SR 13. Davis stated that connector is a carry over from the previous thoroughfare plan. Davis stated this would be a very expensive corridor where we could take it right up to SR 32 and let SR 32 jog over to SR 13. The SR 13 connector is part of Noblesville's plan and the county plan.

Parkway Classification

Rusty Holt reviewed the maps containing arterials and potential parkways. R. Holt asked if the Commissioners want a separate parkway classification? Mueller stated within the comprehensive plan and the greenway plan (which was not officially adopted) both documents recommended coming up with parkways within Hamilton County. This would have more of an emphasis on a trail system. Right now within all of the classifications they have included pedestrian components for each roadway classification. It is a matter of if we want more emphasis or should we have all of the classifications incorporating these trails. Davis stated there is not much difference between an arterial and a parkway other than the name. There is a little difference in right of way requirements between the two classifications. Davis recommending staying with the primary, secondary and collector then as you build the roads then you would incorporate what is appropriate for the roadway and not have five different classifications for the overall thoroughfare plan. Altman clarified that they all incorporate pathways? Davis stated they are all incorporating pathways and sidewalks. One of the goals is to look for continuity throughout the county for inter-county transportation.

Altman asked if we will still have big gaps on 96<sup>th</sup> Street? Davis stated no. R. Holt stated the secondary arterials fill in the gaps on 96<sup>th</sup> Street. Altman stated the 96<sup>th</sup> Street study was run by landowners, how do we correct the study? Davis stated we can discount that study and look at traffic volumes, counts and connectivity's. Altman stated we have a bridge. S. Holt stated the disconnect was not the landowners it was the city backing them. Altman asked if this is still Carmel's intent? Altman asked Mueller to check with Carmel. Mueller stated they will look at the traffic volumes and land use and check with Carmel.

Holt stated 256<sup>th</sup> Street can truly be a thoroughfare because it does not go through a municipality. Altman asked if we have put money in 266<sup>th</sup>? Holt stated no, 236<sup>th</sup> has the traffic count. Altman stated the switch would be appropriate at this time, she would support that.

SR 37 and Cyntheanne Road

Discussion of SR 37 was held. Dillinger stated a Corradino study done 10 years ago showed relocating SR 37 to the east where it would shoot down Promise or one of those other roads. Altman stated ultimately where do people want to end up when they are traveling south on SR 37? Dillinger stated it swoops back in at I-69. Altman stated that was her question on Cyntheanne Road, if indeed an exchange is there it would be more logical than I-69. Holt asked if we want to do this with Cyntheanne? The Commissioners had consensus to make the change to Cyntheanne Road.

Davis asked if the Commissioners would like to see the potential parkway classifications shown on the thoroughfare plan? Altman asked what additional amenities do we have on a parkway that are outside? Altman stated she does not see any difference, she would rather take the position that primaries and secondaries will accommodate all pedestrian travel. Mr. Joel Thurman stated currently there is a parkway designation in Carmel and it was only put on there to match and work with Carmel at that time. Consensus was to leave primary and secondary classifications.

Holt left the meeting. [9:43:44]

Sidewalk and Pathway Widths

Davis asked what the Commissioners want as sidewalk widths and pathway widths? Davis stated the MPO has done a regional pedestrian plan that has incorporated Hamilton County. Their recommendation is 10' paths and 5' sidewalks. We have normally not provided that wide of a path. R. Holt stated Fishers and Noblesville use 8' paths and Westfield is proposing 8', and Carmel uses 10'. Altman stated if these become popular, like the Monon Trail, we really need 10'. Mueller stated ASHTO recommends 8' widths and the existing HCAT states two-way traffic is 10' minimum and 12' is advised. Davis recommended 5' for sidewalks. Altman and Dillinger agreed to 10' for pathways and 5' for sidewalks.

126<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge

Davis stated the maps show a new bridge at 126<sup>th</sup> Street crossing the river, should this be kept on the plan? Dillinger and Altman agreed to leave it on the plan.

HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
DECEMBER 21, 2006 – HIGHWAY MEETING

Rustic Roads

Davis stated there is reference to Rustic Roads in the comprehensive plan. It is his preference to not designate anything as a rustic road in the plan. A rustic road is a historical road that you do basic maintenance to and nothing else. It is to be preserved as a rural road. Davis stated he is comfortable leaving it in the comprehensive plan but don't put it in the thoroughfare plan. Altman and Dillinger agreed.

Adoption Process

Davis stated there will be a public hearing with the adoption process. There is a web site that has all of this information on it. Davis asked if we should call a separate meeting to show the public what the plan is. Altman asked if we anticipate any major issues with the other jurisdictions? Davis stated they are all on the steering committee and have been involved and aware of the process. Altman asked if we should hold a public meeting and then a separate meeting inviting all of the elected officials to look at the plan. Dillinger stated we should have the public officials buy into it. Dillinger suggested Schneider ask if the elected officials want a meeting or if they are satisfied and would possibly sign-off on the program.

**Bridge Maintenance** [10:00:30]

Davis stated he has spoken with the municipalities about an Interlocal agreement regarding clarifying responsibilities for bridge maintenance and they have all agreed to the concept. The Cumulative Bridge Fund has been done away with. There is still a question if the county is still going to maintain bridges 20' or over. It makes sense for one entity to look over the bridges because that is the way the State operates with their programs. In terms of federal aid one entity can establish priorities. The federal aid process only allows four (4) bridges in at one time and if each entity is doing their own thing they will all be in competition with each other. The new thinking at INDOT appears to be that if you have a bridge project and final construction documents are not turned in you will still be credited as an active bridge project. This means if someone does not get their final documents submitted you would not be allowed to put another bridge into the program, even though the bridge was completed two years ago. It makes sense to have one entity take care of all of those structures. Mr. Matt Knight stated there are 262 bridges in our inventory. 19 are major bridge (over 200' span, are the counties responsibility and are covered by the Major Bridge Fund). Carmel has 44 bridges, Fishers-17, Noblesville-24 and Westfield-14. This leaves 144 bridges on county roads (20' or longer). The last inspection report recommended replacement of 30 bridges countywide. We have already replaced eight (8) and seven (7) more are currently under designed. This leaves 15 bridges that need replaced, six (6) of those are within corporate limits of a city or town. Nine (9) are on county roads. Estimated costs for structures needing major work is \$2 million over the next 10 years. Altman stated if we were to entertain an Interlocal agreement and re-instate the Cumulative Bridge Fund, the county would make the decision of what is to be fixed and the other agreement is that the county is on the only one to apply for federal funds. Altman asked if this revision in conflict with the bridge inspection report? Knight stated not what bridges need fixed but how they are repaired is different.

Davis stated in terms of funding the Cumulative Bridge Fund, the property tax portion that fed into this fund had been reduced. The bridge work was supplemented with COIT money to take advantage of the Property Tax Replacement Credit (PTRC). Davis stated there are a couple of options, one is to re-instate the Cumulative Bridge Fund and shift the money going into Cumulative Courthouse into Cumulative Bridge and then supplement with CCD or general fund money. Mills stated you could do that but it would take Council approval. Davis stated the other option is whether we even need to bring the Cumulative Bridge fund back. We would still have the liability if we have the fund. We are consistently getting \$300,000 from the CCD fund for bridges. We feel we can still handle the bridges, with this impact, with the current CCD funding. Knight asked if we keep using CCD money do we really need the Interlocal Agreements or go on as we were? Altman stated the Interlocal would be helpful that they agreed to not apply for federal funds. Thurman stated federal funds for replacement, such as the 126<sup>th</sup> Street bridge, is a separate issue. Under this replacement it needs to meet a certain rating and in the next 10 years there will be a lot of bridges that won't qualify for that. Altman stated she will discuss this with the Council and asked the Auditor and the highway department to get the numbers together.

Dillinger adjourned the meeting. [10:21:40]

**Present**

Christine Altman, Commissioner  
Steven C. Dillinger, Commissioner  
Steven A. Holt, Commissioner  
Robin M. Mills, Auditor  
Michael Howard, Attorney  
Darren Murphy, Attorney  
Brad Davis, Highway Director  
Joel Thurman, Interim Highway Engineer  
Matt Knight, Highway Staff Engineer  
Nicole Mueller, Schneider Corporation  
Rusty Holt, Schneider Corporation  
Fred Swift, Administrative Assistant to Commissioners  
Kim Rauch, Administrative Assistant to Auditor

APPROVED  
HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

ATTEST

\_\_\_\_\_  
Robin M. Mills, Auditor